

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 11, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al. (US 5,991,134) in view of Shigemoto (US 5,923,570) and Otomo et al. (US5,784,235).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, and 6-8, canceled claims 5, 9-11 and 15-16, and added new claims 46-49 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 6-8, and 46-49 are pending for consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 11, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al. (US 5,991,134) in view of Shigemoto (US 5,923,570) and Otomo et al. (US5,784,235).

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a semiconductor integrated circuit device including, in part, “first transistor forming an input element, connected to said inter-circuit signal wire, in one of said two internal circuits” and “a plurality of second transistors, for protecting said first transistor, being arranged adjacent to said first transistor in said one of said two internal circuits and including a transistor of an identical structure to said first transistor,” wherein gates of said plurality of second transistors are connected only to said power lines of said one of said two internal circuits.”

In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Tan et al. is completely silent with regard to the combination of features recited by amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2, 3, 6-8, and 46-49. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that Shigemoto and Otomo et al., whether taken singly or combined, completely fail to teach or suggest the combination of features recited by amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2, 3, 6-8, and 46-49. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Shigemoto and Otomo et al., whether taken singly or combined, fail to remedy the deficiencies of Tan et al.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by Tan et al., Shigemoto, and/or Otomo et al., whether taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 060301-5003
Application No.: 09/625,643
Page 17

time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By:



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: December 22, 2004

Customer No. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202.739.3000
Fax: 202.739.3001